EXHIBIT E

Page 1 1 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 3 Lead Case No. 08-99000-smb Case No. 08-01789-smb 5 6 In the Matter of: 7 SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION, 8 Plaintiff, 9 v. 10 BERNARD L. MADOFF INVESTMENT SECURITIES, LLC, et al., 11 Defendants. 12 13 14 United States Bankruptcy Court 15 One Bowling Green 16 New York, NY 10004 17 18 July 25, 2018 19 10:10 AM 20 21 BEFORE: 22 HON STUART M. BERNSTEIN 23 U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE 24 25 ECRO: UNKNOWN

Page 2 HEARING re Conference re Motion for an Order Establishing Omnibus Proceeding for the Purpose of Determining the Existence, Duration and Scope of the Ponzi Scheme at BLMIS Transcribed by: Sonya Ledanski Hyde

	Deci EX E -2016-07-25 Transcript of proceedings Pg 4 of 14	Page 3
		3
1	APPEARANCES:	
2		
3	BAKER HOSTETLER	
4	Attorneys for Trustee BLMIS	
5	45 Rockefeller Plaza	
6	New York, NY 10111	
7		
8	BY: NICHOLAS J. CREMONA	
9	AMANDA E. FEIN	
10	STACEY A. BELL	
11	MELISSA L. KOSACK	
12	MAXIMILLIAN S. SHIFRIN	
13		
14	DENTONS US LLP	
15	Attorneys for Defendants	
16	1221 Avenue of the Americas	
17	New York, NY 10020	
18		
19	BY: CAROLE NEVILLE	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	200	X E 2010 07 23 Transcript of proceedings 1 g 3 of 14	Page 4
1	PRYO	R CASHMAN LLP	
2		Attorneys for the Defendants	
3		7 Times Square	
4		New York, NY 10036	
5			
6	BY:	RICHARD LEVY, JR.	
7			
8	MCDE	RMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP	
9		Attorneys for Sage Associates, Sage Realty,	Malcolm
10		Sage, Martin Sage, Ann Sage	
11		340 Madison Avenue	
12		New York, NY 10173	
13			
14	BY:	ANDREW B. KRATENSTEIN	
15			
16	HUNT	ON ANDREWS KURTH LLP	
17		Attorneys for Defendants	
18		200 Park Avenue	
19		New York, NY 10166	
20			
21	BY:	RICHARD A. RICH	
22			
23			
24			
25			

		L 2010 07 25 Transcript of proceedings T g 0 of 14	Page 5
1	FISHE	RBROYLES LLP	
2		Attorneys for Defendants	
3		445 Park Avenue	
4		New York, NY 10022	
5			
6	BY:	RICHARD A. KIRBY	
7			
8	STEVE	NS & LEE	
9		Attorneys for Legacy Capital	
10		485 Madison Avenue, 20th Floor	
11		New York, NY 10022	
12			
13	BY:	NICHOLAS F. KAJON	
14			
15	CHAIT	'MAN LLP	
16		Attorneys for Defendants	
17		465 Park Avenue	
18		New York, NY 10022	
19			
20	BY:	HELEN DAVIS CHAITMAN	
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

where fact discovery is open under existing CMOs. The second group, in the Trustee's view, would be the cases that participated in Madoff's deposition. And then the third group of cases are cases where discovery is closed and they did not participate in Madoff's deposition. And I'll take those (indiscernible).

Cases with open fact discovery -- I don't think

Cases with open fact discovery -- I don't think

that there would -- I don't expect there to be disagreement,

and I think we've gotten that far with the negotiations

where Defendants would agree that those would be part of a

consolidated proceeding. There are seven of those cases.

With respect to the cases that participated in Madoff's deposition, of the objecting parties there are 92 of those cases that participated in Madoff's deposition.

And given the deposition, in the Trustee's view, it's reasonable at this juncture to seek to take additional discovery on the Ponzi issue to refute the issues injected into the case by Mr. Madoff's deposition.

And, Your Honor, just -- if you would indulge me a bit, just to go through how Madoff's deposition --

THE COURT: What discovery does the Trustee need?

The Trustee's been preparing these cases for ten years or eight years.

MS. BELL: Yes, Your Honor, and that is absolutely correct. And I think as we addressed at the last hearing,

he was deposed for three days. And day two he was deposed for two days.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. BELL: But, Your Honor, the arguments have advanced beyond the convertible arb and beyond the start date of the Ponzi scheme. So --

THE COURT: But that's what I'm -- that's what I'm trying to find out, because all your order says is we've got four months of fact discovery and it's not supposed to be a complete do-over.

MS. BELL: Right, and I agree with that, Your
Honor. So, what the Trustee was attempting to do in this
order was, in our meet and confer, the Defendants raised the
issue of the 27 subpoenas that Ms. Chaitman served. If you
recall in the original order, the Trustee had a limited
number of discovery. We tried to do it based on numbers so
the Court would see from the Trustee's perspective we're not
trying to have this go for many, many months and to be an
open-ended process.

In this order we did not do that simply to accommodate the request to have those 27 trader subpoenas.

And I think that's worth talking about as well, because not only do we have Madoff's deposition that the Defendants have requested but there are 27 trader subpoenas of former BLMIS employees who worked on the House 5 side. I think there was

Page 39 THE COURT: Let me hear from some of the other 1 2 parties. 3 MS. CHAITMAN: I just want to say one thing, Judge. If I came in and I said, "You know, Judge, 4 5 discovery's over in my cases but I now think that I really should be able to take certain discovery..." I wouldn't get 7 two feet in this court. And that's what the Trustee's 8 trying to do. 9 Again, if you look at every one of my answers, you'll see I disputed that there was a Ponzi scheme. This 10 11 has been in the case since I filed the answers. Thank you. THE COURT: Ms. Neville? 12 13 MS. NEVILLE: Good morning. Carole Neville from 14 Dentons. Your Honor, I have 14 clients on this -- in this 15 matter now, and the case management order, and all but one 16 of them said that discovery closed. And I'm finding it kind 17 of staggering that Ms. Davis now says that after ten years and a billion dollars, the Trustee has not taken discovery 18 19 on the Ponzi issue. 20 We have expert reports in all of our cases. 21 was happening then? What were they doing? Right now, what 22 I hear, if I'm --23 THE COURT: What was the date of the Dubinsky 24 Report? Because that was -- 2013? 25 MR. KRATENSTEIN: It was 2013.

THE COURT: 2013. So, certainly the issue was up there then.

MS. NEVILLE: So, I'm hearing now that of 153 -because it's not 106 cases or 105; it's 153 -- there are
seven cases where discovery is open and they want to have a
consolidated order that cuts off discovery from everybody
else? They were obliged to make a motion to show why they
were entitled to discovery.

What that order from, I think it was September 2017, says is that discovery is closed except for the right for the right for the Picower parties, of all people, the Defendants, and the Trustee and SIPC to take discovery on the Madoff. And the Court reserved the issues from the June 29th transcript, which I have with me and I read carefully yesterday. There were two issues that were reserved, and they both were the issues Ms. Chaitman raised. There was the production of trading records and the deposition of traders.

So, the discovery obligation is from the Trustee to us. Why they now want to open up 12 depositions of Madoff employees to prove the case -- because I think they realize they haven't proved it after all of these years and after all of this money.

Rule 16 sets out a standard and I don't think they've met it. They've been not diligent in pursuing their

evaluate.

THE COURT: All right. Look, I'm not going to grant this motion on the state of this record. The order on which this is all predicated -- there are actually two of them, but the first Madoff deposition order said -- in Paragraph 11 -- it says, "As to the participating customers whose fact discovery is set to close on or after the date, the Court extends fact discovery for the limited and sole purpose of taking Madoff's deposition."

It then says, "Other than for that purpose, the deadlines in the applicable case management orders remain unchanged, notwithstanding the dates set forth in the case management orders. Counsel for the Trustee, the participating customers, the Picower parties, and SIPC have the right to move the Court for further discovery based upon Madoff's testimony."

If you're going to make that motion, you have to show specifically what it is Madoff said that's new, that you couldn't have anticipated with due diligence of taking that discovery. I'm being told -- and part of the problem of this process is people tell me a lot of stuff, and it's not contained in a pleading. But I'm told that some of these issues were always issues in the case and at some point, somebody got the idea they wanted to take Madoff's deposition. I don't even know how that -- I don't recall

1 discovery is after the close of fact discovery typically. 2 THE COURT: And you oppose her taking those depositions if, for no other reason, you want a consolidated 3 proceeding in which everybody attends those depositions? 4 5 MS. BELL: Well, we thought it would make sense, 6 Your Honor. For example, she had David Kugel on the list of 7 27 traders. He has a plea allocution and he testified at the criminal trial. There are a number of issues that will 8 9 go across cases. And so we think it's not efficient to 10 proceed with those --11 THE COURT: Why don't you make your motion to 12 modify the pretrial orders to reopen discovery? 13 MS. BELL: Yes, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: And do that expeditiously. Now, with 15 respect -- there's got to be a time limit, though, Ms. 16 Chaitman, with you doing something about this issue. 17 MS. CHAITMAN: I will make the motion -- Judge, if 18 Baker had not indicated to me that they would produce all 19 the trading records without my going back to Judge Moss, I 20 would have done it already. But I will go back to Judge 21 Moss, but I'd like to be able to proceed with the subpoenaed 22 depositions. The traders have both documents and testimony. I think I want to decide the Trustee's 23 THE COURT: 24 motion first, because everybody's going to want to come to

Kugel's deposition, for example, if I reopen discovery.

25

Page 91 CERTIFICATION I, Sonya Ledanski Hyde, certified that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. Sonya Ledanski Hyde Veritext Legal Solutions 330 Old Country Road Suite 300 Mineola, NY 11501 Date: